DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 480 125 TM 035 196

AUTHOR	Eddy, Pamela L.
TITLE	Talking about the Community College President: Is It Still a Man's World?
PUB DATE	2003-04-00
NOTE	26p.; For a related study, see TM 035 194. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, April 21-25, 2003).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Presidents; Communication (Thought Transfer); *Community Colleges; *Gender Issues; Higher Education; *Leadership Styles; *Sex Differences

ABSTRACT

The role of gender in presidential communications and leadership on campus was studied through an exploration of the language 2-year college presidents used to describe their own leadership. The study also considered whether gendered concepts of leadership were reified by campus members. Participants were two community college presidents, one male and one female, and interviews were also held with staff and faculty members. Findings show that language descriptors used to describe the presidents were gendered, and the campuses also supported the creation of a reality of them as male and female leaders. However, the finding that each leader was "doing gender" did not provide a complete picture of the enactment of leadership at the two community colleges. The male president actually showed more participatory and generative leadership characteristics than the female leader. (Contains 35 references.) (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

TM TMTR 0212

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P. Eddy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 480 125

Talking About The Community College President: Is It Still A Man's World?

American Educational Research Association
April 21, 2003
Chicago, Illinois

TM035196

Pamela L. Eddy, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Central Michigan University
Educational Administration and Community Leadership
Ronan 319B
Mt. Pleasant, MI 48559
989.774.1162
pamela.eddy@cmich.edu

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Talking About the Community College President: Is it Still a Man's World?

Conversations around gender and leadership often devolve to pitting the styles of women against those of men. In a similar manner, differing communication styles of men and women are often compared using a deficit model, with women coming up short. Given the current leadership crisis in community colleges (Evelyn, 2001) and the increase in women ascending to positions of leadership in colleges and universities (Ross & Green, 2000), the role of gender takes on increased importance in discussions on community college leadership. Even though the number of women college presidents is on the rise, particularly at the two-year college, the increases are still below the number of women in the pipeline (Glazer-Raymo, 1999). Moreover, the breath of leadership needs at the community college level complicates the search for new presidents. Currently the Carnegie classification of community colleges places all colleges in one category, but work in underway to recognize the differences inherent among community colleges (McCormick, 2002).

Communication is important for leaders not only in the everyday operations of the campus, but also plays a critical role as a lever for organizational change (Kotter, 1996; Rowley, Lujan, & Dolence, 1997). Given the fact that communication is important for leaders and that organizational change is the watchword of the day in higher education, what role does gender play in presidential communications and leadership on campus? To begin to address this question, this research considered two two-year college presidents and the language they used to self-describe their leadership. Secondly, the study addressed if gendered concepts of leadership was reified by campus members.

Literature and Theoretical Framework

Research on women's leadership notes that women are judged against male norms (Chliwniak, 1997; Monroehurst, 1997), despite some findings that highlight that women are more effective leaders (Rosser, 2001) and communicators (Moskal, 1997). As they assume more positions of leadership in colleges and universities, women administrators face different constraints than their male counterparts (Glazer-Raymo, 1999). Strongly held cultural beliefs about leaders and leadership are rampant in colleges and universities. "Workplaces are gendered both by the numerical predominance of one sex within them and by the cultural interpretations of given types of work which, in conjunction with cultural norms and interpretations of gender, dictate who is understood as best suited for different sorts of employment" (McElhinny, 1998, p. 309). Historically, particular roles and expectations faced women and men in their employment positions, with traditional conceptions of leaders and of college presidents invoking images of men.

Often expressed metaphors depicting leaders use a male model. Hero, great man, quarterback, superman, and father figure, for example, do not elicit images of women, nor do they readily generate analogous expressions that describe women leaders. Maintaining such limited definitions and images of leaders leaves women with a narrow band of acceptable leader behavior (Amey & Twombly, 1992). Women administrators report feelings of marginalization and lack of authenticity and evidence of cumulative disadvantage when confronted with the choice of professional promotion by adhering to traditional norms and expectations or enacting a more personally genuine, and therefore, perhaps more female construction of leadership (Amey, 1999).

Communication plays a central role in the enactment of leadership on campus. As with research on leadership, communication scholarship asserts that the way in which women communicate can limit their ability to express traditional leadership characteristics, especially when measured against a male norm (Tannen, 1994). The continued male monopoly over language aids in ensuring their primacy when males are defined as the pinnacle, in turn, automatically placing females in a lower position. "The semantic rule which has been responsible for the manifestation of sexism in the language can be simply stated: there are two fundamental categories, *male* and *minus male*" (Spender, 1981, p. 23, italics in original). The staging of categories of male and minus male uses a dominance approach in which male is viewed as dominant and female as subordinate, thereby creating a deficit model (Coates, 1998). In this categorization women can never acquire the desired state of male. One way in which women compensate for their perceived lower status is to pay attention to "symbolic capital" (Eckert, 1998, p. 67). One of the forms of symbolism women use involves using standard language, in other words, "talking for success" (Eckert, 1998, p. 67) or the use of more "socially prestigious speech then men" (Eisikovitis, 1998, p. 47). Attending to the rules of speech and employing greater stylistic variation then men contributes to supporting the ideal of women's use of language within a binary analysis of men and women.

Spender (1981) argues that one needs to know how sexism in language operates in order to deal with it. "The problem lies not in the words but in the semantic rule which governs their positive or negative connotations" (Spender, 1981, p. 29). Some words that have positive connotations for men are negative for women (e.g., aggressive, tough). Semantic rules are complicated by the issue of "doing gender" (West & Zimmerman, 1987) in which individuals are penalized for acting in a manner inconsistent with their gender. As a result, individuals lock

themselves into activities supporting the socially acceptable behavior for their gender. "Doing gender" builds on creating differences between men and women that are then "used to reinforce the 'essentialness' of gender" (West & Zimmerman, 1987, p. 140). Language then acts to reinforce what it means to be a male or female leader based on essential features with the male and female speakers themselves reinforcing certain kinds of gender identity (Cameron, 1998).

Another theoretical construction of "doing gender" is performativity. Butler (1990) conceptualized performativity as the social construction of gender, in which "gender is the repeated stylization of the body, a set of repeated acts within a rigid regulatory frame which congeal over time to produce the appearance of substance, of a 'natural' kind of being" (p. 33). The constant enactment and display of particular characteristics that meet the cultural norms of society, thus, serve to define masculinity and femininity—ultimately resulting in "doing gender" (West & Zimmerman, 1987).

The influence of male language usage influences organizational culture (Morgan, 1997). A particular issue concerns how organizational culture impacts the creation of social reality. The use of language feeds into the creation of reality in determining what is valued (Berger & Luckmann, 1966). Thus, if the language is male normed, the reality created is male normed. Similar to Spender's (1981) point that the male norm forms the hierarchy of language use, Gilligan (1982) and Helgesen (1995) suggest that male domination of normative behavior also occurs in organizations. "Women moving into [institutions] are generally seen as interlopers, and are at greater pains to prove that they belong" (Eckert, 1998, p. 67). Language use serves to reinforce the cultural ideal of male hegemony within organizations where a patriarchal frame of values interprets reality. It is "obvious that those who have the power to make the symbols and

their meanings are in a privileged and highly advantageous position" in creating reality (Spender, 1981, p. 142).

Given the bias of language and organizational analysis toward male norms, Spender (1981) argues for the deconstruction of language. Amey and Twombly (1992) used deconstruction of language to study leadership at community colleges. They discovered that the discourse used to recount the organizational development of the community college sector continuously reinforced the ideology of the dominant class—a relatively small group of White male scholars and practitioners. The effect of writing on community college leadership using a White male norm was the systematic exclusion of those not using the same language, exhibiting the characteristic behavior, or fitting the symbolic image of leadership perpetuated by White male authors. The issue then becomes that women and people of color cannot fit the images of leadership portrayed in the community college literature.

Semantic rules and language based on the male norm exclude the creation of positive images of women. The lack of ability to name the created, shared organizational reality silences women, resulting in domination of men in a patriarchal order. Women support this order by their very silence and lack of language to challenge the hierarchy. "New symbols will need to be created and old symbols will need to be recycled and invested with new images if the male hold of language is to be broken" (Spender, 1981, p. 162).

In many organizations, gender-related values dominate and bias organizational life in favor of one sex over another. These biases also shape and sustain the day-to-day basis of organizational reality (Morgan, 1997). The subtleties associated with gender often create different experiences of the same organizational situation and present many practical problems for the way men and women interact on a daily basis. Language, thus, serves as a force in

creating the culture of an organization and also as a form of power. The use of language perpetuates organizational power differentials, especially in the male dominated reality created in organizations.

Previous research summarizes men's and women's leadership as being hero like or generative, respectively (Chliwniak, 1997). Sagaria and Johnsrud (1988) proposed that women as generative leaders operate from a perspective of creating an environment that enables individuals to grow and develop, in which the foundation of the organizational context builds on the concepts of participation and empowerment. Patterns of male leadership emphasize a more authoritative role, in which power often manifests itself in the positional leadership of the president. Research on the perceptions of male and female leaders highlighted that "leaders were viewed more positively when they used a leadership style that was typical of and consistent with their gender" (Griffin, 1992, p. 14). Thus, leaders were rewarded for "doing gender" that reinforced historic assumptions of male and female leadership characteristics.

Methodology

The two sites in this research were originally part of a larger study related to a multi-campus strategic alliance (Eddy, 1999). The two colleges were chosen for further study because each had recently hired college presidents from outside the state's postsecondary system and the campuses they led had undergone organizational change, partially as a result of the alliance. In addition, a male president led one college, while the other had a woman at its helm. The primary focus of the research was how each of the presidents chose to frame the change initiatives on their campus. A secondary intent of the research was to investigate the role of gender in

leadership. The pseudonyms selected for the colleges in this study were Monroe State College and Davis State College. The pseudonyms given the participating leaders were President Peter Harvey from Monroe State and President Maria Brooks of Davis State.

Semi-structured interviews occurred with the college presidents, members of their senior cabinet, and faculty members. Some of the faculty members served as department chairs as well. A campus liaison named by the college president solicited faculty and staff participation. Artifacts collected included copies of planning documents, regional accreditation self-study reports, campus newsletters, text from public speeches, and marketing pieces. On campus interviews totaled 28, with 15 participants at Davis State and 13 at Monroe State. Pilot interviews helped refine the interview protocol.

Transcriptions of the interviews were verbatim, providing the basis for coding of themes. A coding scheme was developed using key words as indicators that were male or female oriented. Construction of the themes was based on West and Zimmerman's (1987) conception of "doing gender." Transcripts were reviewed for instances where informants referred to the president in gendered terms. Some referents were quite specific (e.g., "lady"), while others were inferred (e.g., "regular guy"). All transcripts were coded for language referring to the president. Categories for male and female language were created for both President Harvey and President Brooks. Coded male language included sentences and phrases based on descriptor inferences of authoritative, directive, hero oriented, or male norms. Female language coding included sentences and phrases using language invoking ideals of generative, participatory, consensus building, or based on a female norm. A potential limitation was researcher bias in terms of what constituted male or female language. To address this issue, discussion of findings with a peer reviewer aided in category validation.

Findings

The language descriptors used to describe President Peter Harvey and President Maria Brooks were gendered. Not only did each president "do gender," their campuses supported the creation of the reality of them as male and female leaders. Comparisons were overtly made regarding Maria's leadership with a male norm. Language associated with Harvey assumed a more "hero" like stance. While the predominant descriptive language reified gendered conceptions of leadership, both leaders were also described using language normally associated with the opposite gender.

Charming and Graceful Leadership

When analyzing the data at Davis State College it became apparent that Maria Brooks was judged against a male norm. Feminine terminology was used by campus members when describing the president's leadership or referring to her actions. In descriptions of Brooks, one campus dean noted, "President Brooks is comparable to many men presidents that I have known." This same dean went on to say, "And I'm happy to be working for her and I think she brings to the table all of the positive things of what a woman brings and she's really smart and she's really well informed." These statements pointed out the reliance of a male norm as the measure of a successful presidency, while noting that a female leader may also bring desirable characteristics to the campus. The president herself alluded to the male norm when she relayed that she was trying to learn to play golf. She noted, "I'm looking at expanding the foundation

board, which is an old boy network of 12 to 14 golfing friends, to 25 to 30 people who would be in a position to give us money." She felt an ability to play with the boys would aid her in her role as president with respect to fundraising.

A new faculty member noted that President Brooks was "willing to use her authority, but she uses it fairly gracefully." The gender loaded term of gracefully reinforces the ideal of the gender of the leader. This description, which uses 'authority,' would normally be linked to a predominately male authoritarian leadership, but the addition of the descriptor of 'gracefully,' instead, makes the language female. Another faculty member commented that the president "seemed knowledgeable, didn't seem flaky or spacey or unfocussed." One cabinet member described the president on the campus, stating, "I think Maria has an enormous amount of personal charm and energy and that people like her and that makes a huge difference." It is interesting to note that the speakers using these female language descriptions of the president were all women. The use of female descriptors of the president by women reinforces the notion of the types of language associated with, and used by, women.

When President Brooks described her first visit to the campus for her interview she noted, "My husband got the little spouse tour. I was the only female candidate." Brooks' description of the interview format indicated a male norm that assumed a female spouse. In describing her first convocation speech the president said she told the campus, "I was particularly well suited to this challenge [of leading a campus with tight resources] because we had raised a family on a single faculty member's salary since I didn't work when our children were young. I was always pinching pennies and managing, so I was very well equipped for this job." The reference to Brooks' role as a wife and mother reinforced links to her gender and called up a particular image of the president for campus members.

Using language that emphasized participation and inclusiveness was apparent at Davis State College. When the president described her college she stated,

> They needed somebody who was positive and who had a lot of energy. Somebody who was really committed to the college and to the community; who was going to move here and live here. Eat and breathe and become an integral part of both the campus and the community. They needed somebody who had some strong leadership, but also would be willing to be a team player and invite a lot of input.

In discussing the notion of being a team player, Brooks noted, "I think there was not a tradition of celebrating community and celebrating success here and I thought that was really important." Campus members commented on her participatory, collegial, style of leadership. One vice president noted, "Her leadership style is that she is a consensus builder. Everything is done within a team exercise, we as a cabinet."

As this vice president discussed the role of consensus building by the president, he recollected the following vignette:

> I can't remember what the issue was, but it was at a cabinet meeting and I said 'I'm sorry, but I don't agree with you Maria.' And that upset her because I was the one guy who was outside the circle of the wagon! And she kept saying, 'But....' And I said, 'Maria, it's not a problem. I just don't agree with you. I'm not going to fight you on it.' Then she'd say, 'But....' And I'd say, 'I'm not going to argue with you on this. We just don't agree.' And there was no way that I was going to change my position, but she was trying to negotiate with me and it

> wasn't really necessary. So, her leadership style is she's the type of person that builds consensus that people want to pay attention to.

When asked to describe how campus members would describe her leadership, Brooks reflected, "I hope what they would say is that I'm the kind of person that tries to seek a lot of input before making a decision, but I'm willing to make a tough decision. I think of myself as being fairly collegial in terms of inviting input and being willing to discuss anything, but ultimately I'm the one who has to live with the outcome." Thus, while both Brooks and campus members described her leadership as generative, the president also acknowledged her role as the final arbitrator and decision maker—a more male correlated trait.

Juxtaposed against the above descriptions of Brooks and her presidency at Davis State College were comments about the president regarding male oriented language with a reliance on authority, directives, and a hierarchy. President Brooks described a recent accreditation team visit whose recommendation included a desire to see improved communication at Davis State. Brooks expressed her surprise at this comment since she felt she provided a number of venues for communication. During her description of ways in which she tried to encourage communication, however, she related, "I try to get out and walk around. I frighten people when I do that! [laughs] 'What's she here for? What's she looking for?' But I hope the more I do it the more accepted it will be." Thus, while Brooks envisioned a particular communication flow on campus, the reality of the campus perception differed.

Brooks discussed the tight resource problems on campus as being her responsibility, rather then an issue to solve in a participatory manner. One cabinet member summed this up as follows, "I think in the financial area that we tend to be top-down and pretty autocratic. And I think while I have authority, I have a lot of responsibility, but sometimes I don't feel like I have

the authority to match the responsibility." Reliance on directives and using the authority of the presidency are normally features associated with male presidents (Moskal, 1997).

The president discussed the traditional use of open forums at Davis State College where campus members could ask questions of the president. Brooks commented,

> I don't particularly care for what has been a tradition here classified as the forum....And it's not that I have anything to hide. People will tell you I'm pretty open, but I feel uncomfortable because I have no idea of what the focus is or what the discussion is....I would like them to be more structured.

Adding structure to the forum discussions created an element of control to the direction of the conversation. This more directive approach runs counter to a participatory environment. Further support of a more directed use of leadership was found when one of the deans described the direction of the campus,

> I think the president has a pretty clear vision about what she wants for the institution and where she wants it to go and she doesn't seem to, as some people do, lose that vision. She is pretty good at sharing that. I would not say excellent, but she's pretty good at sharing that. I think that the closer to her that you are, the more that you get a sense of that. I'm not sure the whole campus necessarily would have that sense.

Thus, while Brooks espoused collaborative and collegial behavior, in reality she depicted a president in charge, with a vision she shared with those closest to her. Brooks reestablished a dean structure at Monroe State during her first year on campus. The use of a hierarchy and the sense that it is the president who is in charge also implies a traditional notion of male normed leadership.

From the perspective of one campus member, the strategic planning framework for what the president called her Plan of Work for the campus was also driven from the top. He stated, "It seemed to be very much an hierarchical approach as opposed to a campus....I'm not aware of any opportunity for exchange of ideas."

Different realities seemed to exist on campus. On the one hand, Brooks was judged via male norms and conformed to traditionally female oriented language and manners of leading by doing gender. On the other hand, there were clearly instances where a more male oriented, authoritarian style, relying on structure and a hierarchy, was in place. While she sought consensus from her inner circle of leadership, other campus members did not necessarily see the connections between their input, through conversations with the president and the public forums, with any campus planning activities.

Regular Guy

When members of Monroe State College described President Peter Harvey they often referred to his attendance at sporting events, particularly hockey, and the fact that he played basketball at noon. When Harvey talked about coming to Monroe State he said, "The campus faculty were ripe for change. They were ready. They were simply looking for someone to say, 'What should we do?' So, there was a receptiveness to any idea and a willingness to try things." This perspective conjures up an image of a knight in white armor arriving to save the day. Further evidence of this image came from his academic vice president when he commented on the experience and background that Harvey brought to the presidency and, moreover, the president's ability to provide the campus with a vision full of potential.

The president, in discussing how he worked to achieve change on his campus, stated, "Of course, then I used the bully-pulpit, no that's the wrong term, then I used the power of the presidency to communicate those goals and constantly refined them…" Communicating the vision and goals for the campus involved working on influencing others on campus. The president elaborated, "Now, there's another piece of that, part of my job is persuasion. But, persuasion is a little different than manipulation. I'm not trying to manipulate people into thinking the way I do, but I'm trying to persuade them with enthusiasm and vision." The vision painted of Harvey by this description is one of a directive leader in charge.

Monroe State College had never had a female president, thus the basis for the prevalent norm of measurement for the president's leadership historically used a male norm. Phrases used to describe Harvey included, "He's the most down to earth guy," "He's what you call a regular guy," "He's a go-getter, a mover and shaker," and "A great straight shooter." The language choices constructed Harvey as the person in charge of change on campus and a "visionary" for the college.

The dean of enrollment noted, "Peter seemed to have an agenda when he came. He knew where he wanted us to go." The special assistant to the president added, "When Peter makes a decision he has a direction in mind on where he wants to go. Everyone can then comment on it and from that, he gets a finalized picture." In discussing the changes made on campus since Harvey arrived, a faculty member recounted, "This guy goes out and gets things done and it's working out." All of these descriptors support male associated descriptions of the president using directives and his authority to accomplish actions.

One of the initiatives Harvey implemented was a "lap-top university" in which students in particular programs all purchased a lap-top computer upon matriculation. The vice president

of administration reflected on this project and stated, "You know that is a change that he had in mind and that he drove. And he drove it by building consensus and he did a pretty good job." As Harvey noted in his quotations above, he thought he did this by persuasion and influence. One cabinet member further discussed the use of the president's influence, "He can be a cheerleader, has been in many cases, gets really excited about things. He gets to the point where he's so excited, he gets you excited and we're rolling along." The director of financial aid reflected that part of the reason for success was that Harvey got the faculty involved with the lap-top initiative and built consensus after making the initial decision.

The role of campus members played a critical part in the organization of Monroe State College. When Harvey talked about consensus it was different than the manner in which consensus was described at Davis State College where President Brooks literally wanted her entire inner circle on the cabinet to be supportive of a decision. Instead when Harvey described the role of the group he said,

> Just because I had the vision it didn't mean I could implement it. I needed to do something before that. I needed to develop a consensus. Consensus is the wrong term. I needed to develop strong support for that from a group of faculty and staff.

Thus, while Harvey wanted campus members to be a part of the decision making process, he looked for building support and using this majority leverage to begin change versus waiting for everyone to be in agreement.

Nonetheless, when campus informants described Harvey's leadership they talked about him encouraging feedback from the faculty. Faculty members commented that they felt involved in the process and had a say in the outcomes. Descriptors usually associated with women's

leadership (Sagaria & Johnsrud, 1988) appeared in campus comments regarding Harvey's leadership, including the following comments describing the president as: "Participatory," "Open," "Accessible," "He really listens to people," "Populist," etc. When campus members described how the president liked to communicate best they often told stories about the president walking around campus, shaking hands, asking after the staff and their family, and posing questions to them. Harvey described himself as a visionary. He elaborated further,

> I'm probably more of a participatory type of person. Balancing that with, you can't lean too far in that direction or you end up in a quagmire and you can't do anything. But you try and figure out ways to blend the participatory management into a truly autocratic style.

Hence, while Harvey exhibited some normally female attributed attributes of participation and inclusion, he, like Brooks, defined himself as ultimately being the person in charge. Many campus members described Harvey as a farsighted leader of action who "let's you do your job."

Discussion

Descriptors for the two leaders in this study highlighted a link between the gender of the president and the language used to describe the president, but the finding that each leader was "doing gender" did not provide a complete picture of the enactment of leadership at Davis State College and Monroe State College. The findings indicate that the male leader, Harvey, employed more participatory and generative leadership characteristics than the female leader, Brooks.

Some research on communication patterns (Eckert, 1998) cautions against broad based generalization regarding gender and language, instead noting that gender is not independent of other aspects of social identity. Thus, thinking of "male" ways of leading and "women's" ways of leading is too simplistic. Leadership occurs on a continuum and is subjected to institutional context (Gillett-Karam, 1994).

Gendered language impacts leaders, however, in reifying acceptable forms of male and female leader attributes, with male norms still the standard bearer of measurement (Chliwniak, 1997; Monroehurst, 1997). While the larger proportion of woman presidents at the community college level should begin to address what is deemed acceptable behavior for the president (Getskow, 1996), the research reported here shows that despite current levels of representation, President Brooks was still judged against male norms. The narrow band of acceptable behavior for women leaders is still prevalent in which women who lead feel they must adhere to traditional norms and expectations of male normed leadership versus enacting a more personal, perhaps more female construction of leadership (Amey & Eddy, 2002).

Moreover, the language used to describe Brooks as using her authority "gracefully," reinforced gendered conceptions of leadership. Furthermore, the double bind for the woman president to "do gender" means they ultimately reinforce the very structures of the male norm that is limiting in the first place. President Brooks acknowledged that she felt she was "weak in terms of the fund raising and I need to work really hard on that." As noted, she is working with the college's "old boy network" of golfing friends who serve on Monroe State's foundation board to increase revenue generation. Increased acceptability of what it means to be a college leader and deconstruction of gender loaded language needs to occur for women presidents to feel judged on their own merits and enact leadership in their personal way.

The concept of "doing gender" reinforces stereotypes that pigeonhole men and women into prescribed roles. In the increasing complex organizational context of the community college, various types of leadership are needed. Moreover, as more women ascend to leadership positions in community colleges, a greater acceptance of female norms should occur (Getskow, 1996). We shortchange our institutions and ourselves when categorizing leaders based strictly on male and female attributes. Rather, supporting and cultivating successful strategies based on human relations skills and consensus building is more productive.

Discussions of leadership and how leaders communicate should no longer be positioned as an either/or choice between men and women. "Making males and females *different* from one another is the essence of gender. It is also the basis of men's power and domination" (Baca Zinn, Hondagneu-Sotelo, & Messner, 2000, p. 2). Views and perceptions regarding women's ways of leading and men's ways of leading result in overgeneralizations of gendered conceptions of leadership and communication being put forth. Rather, borrowing Baca Zinn, Hondagneu-Sotelo, and Messner's (2000) concept of a 'prism of difference' allows for consideration of a larger spectrum of communication regarding leaders and presidents' ways of leading. These authors envision seeing "gender organized and experienced differently when refracted through the prism of sexual, racial/ethnic, social class, physical abilities, age, and national citizenship differences" (2000, p.1). Thus, gender is simply not a matter of two categories of male and female, rather a "range of social relations among differently situated people" (2000, p. 6). New conceptualization of gender provides areas of scholarship that move beyond the borders of listing differences. This conception of the intersections of gender and leadership supports research conducted by Gillett-Karam (1994) on two-year college presidents in which she concluded that leadership skills are more apt to be situational than gendered.

Conclusion

Viewing gender in a more complex fashion highlights how traits traditionally associated with the essential nature of men and women become obscured and the boundaries separating genders blur. When considering gendered language associated with leadership, a more integrated and connected ideal emerges that makes a list of male and female attributes obsolete. As evidenced in this study, while some of the language supported "doing gender" for both presidents, the actions and perceptions of Brooks and Harvey by themselves and campus members was not strictly sex linked. Both presidents exhibited what historically would be essential characteristics of the opposite gender.

A new model for considering the language of leadership could be represented by a three dimensional matrix. The strands cutting across the dimensions would represent the spectrum of possible gender constructions, communication patterns, and leadership attributes. The variety of combinations in this setting would allow for a greater number of intersections of leadership behaviors. In this case, the location of Brooks' communication and leadership styles would capture both participatory and authoritarian concepts of what makes up her presidency. In a like manner, Harvey's styles would also reflect the variability represented in his leadership.

Instead of viewing leadership as two separate categories, a matrix model allows for greater intersections of the range of characteristics that make up how a person enacts leadership. The key to the implementation of this more complex view of leadership is destroying the narrow band of acceptable leadership with its roots in male norms. Diverse considerations of ways of leading community colleges begins to address the demands these institutions currently face and

begins to access resources that others than those following a White male norm can bring to the institutions. When President Brooks reflected on the stories shared with her when first joining Monroe State College, she commented what she heard most often was, "We've always done it that way. You know, that's one of the one I heard a lot!" She in turn would ask, "Why?" The challenge remains to continue to ask why and to break down the past practice of acceptable and normed leadership conceptions based only on males and past practice. Instead, conceptions of leadership need to become more inclusive and based on a continuum of appropriate characteristics that defines what it means to be a community college president.

References

Amey, M. J. (1999). Navigating the raging river: Reconciling issues of identity, inclusion, and administrative practice. In K. Shaw, R. A. Rhoads, & J. Valadez (Eds.), *Community colleges as cultural texts: Qualitative explorations of organizational and student cultures*. Albany: SUNY Press.

Amey, M. J., & Eddy, P. L. (2002). Leadership. In A. M. Martinez Aleman & K. A. Renn (Eds.), *Women in higher education: An encyclopedia* (pp. 482-486). Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, Inc.

Amey, M. J., & Twombly, S. B. (1992). Revisioning leadership in community colleges. *The Review of Higher Education, 15*(2), 125-150.

Baca Zinn, M., Hondagneu-Sotelo, P., Messner, M.A. (Eds.). (2000) *Gender through the prism of difference* (2nd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social constructivism of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, Inc.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. (1997). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York: Routledge.

Cameron, D. (1998). Performing gender identity: Young men's talk and the construction of heterosexual masculinity. In J. Coates (Ed.), *Language and gender: A reader* (pp. 270-284). Oxford: Blackwell.

Chliwniak, L. (1997). Higher education leadership: Analyzing the gender gap. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports, 25*(4), 1-97.

Coates, J. (Ed.). (1996). *Language and gender: A reader*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Eckert, P. (1998). Gender and sociolinguistic variation. In J. Coates (Ed.), *Language and gender: A reader* (pp. 64-75). Oxford: Blackwell.

Eddy, P. L. (1999). Change in higher education through strategic alliances: A case study. Unpublished manuscript.

Eisikovits, E. (1998). Girl-talk/boy-talk: Sex differences in adolescent speech. In J. Coates (Ed.), *Language and gender: A reader* (pp. 42-54). Oxford: Blackwell.

Evelyn, J. (2001). Community colleges face a crisis of leadership. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (April 6, 2001), A36.

Getskow, V. (1996). *Women in community college leadership roles*. ERIC Clearinghouse for Community Colleges: Los Angeles, CA, EDO-JC-97-02.

Gillett-Karam, R. (1994). Women and leadership. In G.A. Baker III (Ed.), *A handbook on the community college in America: Its history, mission, and management,* (pp. 94-108). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Glazer-Raymo, J. (1999). *Shattering the myths: Women in academe*. Baltimore, MD: The Peters Hopkins University Press.

Griffin, B. Q. (1992, March). *Perceptions of managers: Effects of leadership style and gender*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association, Knoxville, TN.

Helgesen, S. (1995). *The web of inclusion: A new architecture for building great organizations.* New York: Currency/Doubleday.

Jablonski, M. (1996). The leadership challenge for women college presidents. *Initiatives, 57*(4), 1-10.

Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading change*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

McElhinny, B. S. (1998). "I don't smile much anymore": Affect, gender, & the discourse of Pittsburgh police officers. In J. Coates (Ed.), *Language and gender: A reader* (pp. 309-327). Oxford: Blackwell.

McCormick, A. C. (2002, November). *Community colleges in the emerging market for postsecondary education.* Paper presented at the Association for the Study of Higher Education Annual Meeting, Sacramento, CA.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Monroehurst, R. (1997). Leadership, women and higher education. In H. Eggins (Ed.), *Women as leaders and managers in higher education* (pp. 3-16). Bristol, PA: The Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.

Moskal, B. (1997). Women make better managers. *The Management Magazine, 246*(Feb. 3, 1997), 17-19.

Morgan, G. (1997). *Images of organization.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Ross, M., & Green, M. (2000). *The American college president: 2000 edition.* Washington, DC: The American Council on Education.

Rosser, V. J. (2001, April). *Women and their effectiveness as leaders: What makes the difference among deans?* Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Seattle, WA.

Rowley, D., Lujan, H., & Dolence, M. (1997). *Strategic change in colleges and universities: Planning to survive and prosper*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sagaria, M. A. & Johnsrud, L. K. (1988). Generative leadership. In M. A. Danowitz Sagaria (Ed.), *Empowering women: Leadership development on campus* (pp. 13-26). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Spender, D. (1981). *Man made language*. London: Pandora Press.

Tannen, D. (1994). *Talking from nine to five: How women's and men's conversational styles affect who gets heard, who gets credit, and what gets done at work*. New York: William Morrow.

West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender & society, 1*(2), 125-151.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

TM035196

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Talking About The CC President: Is it still a Man's World?	
Author(s): Dr. Pamela Eddy	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date: 4/03

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 1	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2A	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2B
Level 1 ☒ Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.	**Level 2A** ☐ Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	**Level 2B** ☐ Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Signature: Pamela L. Eddy	Printed Name/Position/Title: Pamela Eddy, Asst. Prof.
Organization/Address: Central Michigan Univ Ronan 319 B, MT Pleasant, MI 48859	Telephone: 989.774.1162 FAX: E-Mail Address: Pamela.Eddy@cmich.edu Date: 7/29/03

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfacility.org

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2001)